UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO **WESTERN DIVISION**

Mary I	E. Lentz,	
	Plaintiff,	
	v.	Case No. 1:01cv599
Cincinnati Insurance Co., et al,		District Judge Michael H. Watson
	Defendants.	
	SPEC	AL INTERROGATORIES
We the	e Jury unanimously find:	
1.		lerance of the evidence that Defendant David Balzano er employment relationship with Defendant CIC, as defined
	YES	NO
	If you answered "NO" to Inte Form.	rrogatory No. 1, please proceed to the appropriate Verdict
	If you answered "YES" to Inte	errogatory No. 1, please proceed to Interrogatory No. 2.
2.	Plaintiff proved by clear and actual malice, as defined in t	convincing evidence that Defendant Balzano acted with he jury instructions.
	<u>X</u> YES	NO
		errogatory No. 2, please indicate the amount of ny, to which Plaintiff is entitled:
	\$ <u></u> - 0 -	

Signed this ______ day of June, 2005.

Neway R. Ciarniello

Outre 3. Vind

Vehico Senda Som

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Mary	Е.	Lentz,
------	----	--------

Plaintiff,

٧.

Case No. 1:01cv599

Cincinnati Insurance Co., et al,

District Judge Michael H. Watson

Defendants.

VERDICT

We the jury, being duly empaneled and sworn, unanimously find for Plaintiff Mary Lentz on her claim of intentional interference with a business relationship and against Defendant David Balzano.

Signed this 23 day of June, 2005.

Ma

Dulme 3. V.

Kathleen Treherne

Drenda & Sm

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Mary E. Lentz,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	Case No. 1:01cv599
Cincinnati Insurance Co., et al,	District Judge Michael H. Watson
Defendants.	
	VERDICT
We the jury, being duly empand	eled and sworn, unanimously find for David Balzano and
against Plaintiff Mary Lentz on her clair	m of intentional interference with a business relationship.
Signed this day of June, 2005.	
	
	·